



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

through the fall of Jerusalem. The whole is divided into thirty-nine chapters, an epilogue, and four appendices. Almost every chapter is introduced, or keyed by one or more quotations from the Old or New Testament, some church father, Josephus, Milton, or some other literary character. Each chapter discusses a portion of the narrative, *e. g.*, chapter xxi. is occupied with 2 Kings 17: 1-41. Of this section we have an elegant rhetorical discussion, brimful of references and hints to illustrative and similar occurrences in all history. These discussions are also interpolated with pat bits of poetry from the wealth of English literature. The foot-notes are copious and valuable, as citing points in the realms of biblical, ecclesiastical and profane history and literature. Among these are found many important critical quotations from the Septuagint, and other critical sources—valuable only for the scholar. Occasionally a paragraph or a page or more of hortatory matter follows some peculiarly applicable principle of action.

The epilogue is in part an apology for the favorable attitude toward some of the results of higher criticism. The appendices are (1) kings of Assyria and some of their inscriptions, (2) the inscription on the tunnel of Siloam, (3) was there a golden calf at Dan? (in *Expositor*, October, 1893), (4) dates of kings of Israel and Judah, as given by Kittel and other modern critics.

The author has followed up with care the best results of work on Second Kings and has given us a valuable compilation, set in his own fascinating literary style.

PRICE.

---

**Das Buch Daniel uebersetzt und erklaert.** VON GEORG BEHRMANN.

The worth of this fresh contribution to Nowack's series of commentaries on the Old Testament must not be measured by its size. Although so thin as to be a pamphlet rather than a volume, the book supplies the working student with all, or almost all, he needs in order to be familiar with the present attitude of judicious criticism to the Daniel question. The comprehensive introduction is a fine piece of scholarly work. It consists of two parts, the former dealing with the character and origin of the book, the latter with the history of its text and fortunes. As regards the date of the book in its present form, Pastor Behrmann agrees with the majority of modern expositors in placing it in the Maccabean period. It was written, he thinks (his view on this point coinciding with Kamphausen's) in the beginning of 164 B. C. This date rests on the double assumption that the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to in 8: 14 was the re-consecration of the temple about the end of 165 B. C., and that the passage was written soon afterwards. The author was one of the Chasidim, from whom the Pharisees are supposed to have been descended. Behrmann is inclined to think with Hitzig that the Essenes had the same origin and that the Book of Daniel represents the tendency which later produced this most exclusive of Jewish sects. If so, it was addressed in the first instance to "retiring circles of Judaism," that is to a select few, not to the general public, for the purpose of encouraging passive resistance to oppres-

sion. This theory which partly reproduces a suggestion of Eichhorn indorsed by König seems hardly to fit in with the subsequent history of the book. We know that it was translated into Greek before the commencement of the Christian era, according to our author as early as 100 B. C. It seems to have been used by the writer of the First Book of Maccabees who flourished not long afterwards and wrote for the nation rather than for a class or sect. In the time of Christ and the Apostles it was held in very high repute by the Jews generally, as we gather from the one reference in the Gospels and from the enthusiastic testimony of Josephus. Is it not difficult to reconcile these facts with the esoteric origin of the book about the middle of the second century B. C.? The unity of the book is advocated against Eichhorn and others. The problem of its bilingual character is bravely attacked but with indifferent success. The proposed solution is as follows: The author of the Book of Daniel was more familiar with Aramaic than Hebrew, as appears from the greater linguistic defectiveness of the Hebrew portions, and therefore, when he had once found it convenient to use Aramaic for a special reason, he went on using it, although that reason no longer applied. In that case why did he pause at the end of the seventh chapter? The key to the mystery seems not yet to have been found. The historical value of the book is more temperately discussed than by some recent critics. Behrmann finds everywhere a basis of tradition. The writer of the Book of Daniel cannot be fairly charged either with invention or adaptation. His Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar are not travesties or doubles of Antiochus Epiphanes. There are mistakes indeed, because the traditions followed were erroneous or confused on some points, but there is no conscious perversion of history. The legendary element is admitted, but it is argued that it must be put down to tradition, not to the writer. We have an instance of error in the statement about "Darius the Mede," who seems to have been compounded of Gobryas, the general of Cyrus and governor of part of Media, with Darius Hystaspis. On the other hand, several of the charges of inaccuracy which have been brought against the book, cannot, in Behrmann's opinion, be sustained. It is not proved, for example, that the writer was acquainted with only two kings of Babylon and four kings of Persia. Belshazzar may have been another name of Evil Merodach, the second of the Babylonian kings. In any case that king is meant; and therefore the mention of his death cannot have anything to do with the end of the Babylonian Empire. There is consequently no such contradiction between the biblical text and the cuniform record as some have affirmed. Even the date in the first verse, ("in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim"), which Driver pronounces "highly improbable," and Kamphausen considers to be an indication of the historical unreliability of the book, is strenuously defended. It is argued that the words of Daniel do not imply the capture and plundering of Jerusalem but only the surrender of part of the temple plate, etc., by the frightened king, whereas the words of Jeremiah (in chapter 25), which have been supposed to contradict this statement, refer to

complete destruction. It is also maintained that an attack of Nebuchadnezzar on Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim is not improbable, as the defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish which took place early in that year, left Judea unprotected. The objection that Nebuchadnezzar was not king at that time is disposed of by the supposition (which König also allows to be possible) that the term "king" is used here proleptically.

Whatever may be thought about some of the details in this part of the introduction there can be no doubt that it is a timely and able protest against the vehemence almost amounting to bitterness with which the historical chapters have been assailed. This part of our notice may fitly close with a sentence from the last page of the introduction. "There is a fairly general consensus of opinion that the book as we have it proceeds from the Maccabean age, but the acknowledgment is also gaining ground that the substance of the book is the product of another age."

Much attention is given to philology both in the introduction and the commentary. As regards the foreign words in the Aramaic text Behrmann agrees in the main with Kautzsch. Two instances of divergent opinion may be mentioned. The word *Sûmpônyā* (3:15) and *Sîpônyū* (5:10) is connected not with the Greek *sûmphonia*, but with *sîphonia*, and is supposed to describe an instrument consisting of small reeds. Another word in the same context, *sabbekā* is regarded as the source of the Greek word *sambuke*, not as a derivative from it. It is suggested that it may be connected with *sabka*, which means wicker-work. The commentary as a whole is learned and suggestive and up to date. Even the *Sendschirli* inscriptions which have only been for a very short time available to scholars have been utilized. Some of the notes on phrases, ideas, and manners and customs are excellent, abounding in information of great service to the student. The exposition of the latter-half of the book runs on the lines generally followed by modern expositors. The fourth beast is, "without doubt," the Empire of Alexander. The "Son of Man," however, is explained to be the Messiah. Space forbids further illustrations of this very careful and instructive book, which well deserves to be placed in every student's library. It is not final. The problem of the Book of Daniel is not yet solved, but the labors of Pastor Behrmann will probably help to accelerate the solution.

W. T. S.

---

**Geschichte der Edomiter.** Von DR. FRANZ BUHL.

A good critical summary of the comparatively few facts recorded concerning the Edomites and their country to be found in the sources of information at present available. The extent of Edom and the sites of its chief cities are minutely discussed with some rather surprising results, one of which is that Petra, (in Dr. Buhl's judgment) is nowhere alluded to in any way in the Old Testament. The scanty data in reference to social life and religion are reviewed, and the history of the people is traced down to the destruction of